



**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

**Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -  
TPSGC**

**11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier**

**Place du Portage , Phase III**

**Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2**

**Gatineau**

**Québec**

**K1A 0S5**

**Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776**

**SOLICITATION AMENDMENT**

**MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION**

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

**Comments - Commentaires**

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

**Raison sociale et adresse du  
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**

Ship Construction, Refit and Related  
Services/Construction navale, Radoubs et services  
connexes

11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier

6C2, Place du Portage

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title - Sujet</b><br>Naval Large Tugs  |   |
| <b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b><br>W8472-185713/B  | <b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b><br>023                                   |
| <b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b><br>W8472-185713   | <b>Date</b><br>2018-10-19   |
| <b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b><br>PW-\$\$MC-017-26882  |   |
| <b>File No. - N° de dossier</b><br>017mc.W8472-185713   | <b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>                                    |
| <b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin<br/>at - à 02:00 PM<br/>on - le 2018-10-31</b>  | <b>Time Zone</b><br>Fuseau horaire<br>Eastern Daylight Saving<br>Time EDT |
| <b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b><br><b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> |   |
| <b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b><br>Lamothe, Brenda  | <b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b><br>017mc                               |
| <b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b><br>(819) 420-2916 ( )  | <b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b><br>( ) -                                       |
| <b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b><br><b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>   |   |

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>  | <b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b> |
| <b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b><br><b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>   |  |
| <b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b><br><b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>   |  |
| <b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm<br/>(type or print)</b><br><b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/<br/>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b> |  |
| <b>Signature</b>   | <b>Date</b>                                  |

**Amendment #23 is raised to post Questions and Answers**

**Annex D**

**BIDDER'S QUESTIONS AND CANADA'S RESPONSES**

**Q.1.** If we are not a direct bidder to Canada, there are some questions that we would like to ask, please confirm if it is acceptable?

**A.1.** Yes this is acceptable. Canada invites any and all of Industry to submit their questions with respect to this Request for Proposal on the Naval Large Tugs.

**Q.2.** The Title page of the RFP describes the project as "Naval Large Tugs Request for info". We assume this is a typo and that this new release is the real thing. Please confirm that is indeed the case.

**A.2.** Yes, this is a typo. Please delete in its entirety the title "Naval Large Tugs Request for info" and insert the following "Naval Large Tugs".

**Q.3.** Please provide the following clarification: NLTP 489 – The French version is different from the English version. In the English version you have removed the requirement that NLTs to have medium speed propulsion engines, but that requirement remains in the French version. Please confirm whether or not the requirement to have medium speed propulsion engines is still valid?

**A.3.** Yes, there is an error in the French translation, medium speed diesel engine prime movers are no longer a requirement.

NLTP 489 (English): The NLT shall have a minimum of two (2) Diesel Engine Prime Movers.

NLTP 489 (Français): Le GRN doit avoir au moins deux (2) tracteurs principaux des moteurs diesel.

**Q.4.** Please provide the following clarification: ANNEX "H" CONTRACT FINANCIAL SECURITY, Part 1, 1.(i)  
a) A performance bond representing fifteen (20) percent of the total price...  
Please confirm whether it is 15% or 20% of the total price?

**A.4.** It is confirmed at fifteen (15) percent of the total price.

**ANNEX "H" CONTRACT FINANCIAL SECURITY - PART 1,**

**1. The Contractor must provide one of the following contract financial securities:**

- (i) (a) A Performance Bond in the amount of fifteen (15) percent of the total bid price for the four (4) Naval Large Tugs (NLT), in the form prescribed below at Part 2 Performance Bond and issued by a surety company listed below; and
- (b) A Labour and Material Payment Bond in the form prescribed below at Part 2 Labour and Material Payment Bond, and issued by an approved surety company listed below, in the amount of seven (7) percent of the total bid price for the four (4) Naval Large Tugs; or
- (ii) A Security Deposit to the value of seven (7) percent of the total bid price for the four (4) Naval Large Tugs; or
- (iii) An Irrevocable Standby Letter of Credit to the value of seven (7) percent of the total bid price or four (4) Naval Large Tugs.

**Q.5.** Please provide the following clarification: PART 3 – INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING BIDS

3.1 Instructions for preparing bids...

Section I: Technical bid (three (3) paper copies)

Section II: Technical Bid (three (3) paper copies)

Page 10 of 83, please confirm that Section II should be titled “Management Bid”?

**A.5.** It is confirmed, Section II – Management Bid.

**PART 3 - BID PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, 3.1 Bid Preparation Instructions**

Due to the nature of the bid solicitation, bids transmitted by facsimile will not be accepted.

Canada requests that Bidders provide their bid in separately bound sections as follows:

Section I: Technical Bid (three hard copies)

Section II: Management Bid (three hard copies)

Section III: Financial Bid (one hard copy)

Section IV: Certifications (two hard copies)

Prices must appear in the financial bid only. No prices must be indicated in any other section of the bid. Canada requests that Bidders follow the format instructions described below in the preparation of their bid:

(a) use 8.5 x 11 inch (216 mm x 279 mm) paper where feasible and with technical drawings, use a minimum of 11 x 17 inch (279 mm x 432 mm) paper to ensure legibility;

(b) use a numbering system that corresponds to the bid solicitation.

In April 2006, Canada issued a policy directing federal departments and agencies to take the necessary steps to incorporate environmental considerations into the procurement process Policy on Green Procurement (<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ecologisation-greening/achats-procurement/politique-policy-eng.html>). To assist Canada in reaching its objectives, Bidders should:

- 1) use 8.5 x 11 inch (216 mm x 279 mm) paper containing fibre certified as originating from a sustainably-managed forest and containing minimum 30% recycled content; and
- 2) use an environmentally-preferable format including black and white printing instead of colour printing, printing double sided/duplex, using staples or clips instead of cerlox, duotangs or binders.

**Q.6. RFP 2.6 Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS) Basis of NLT**

It is critical that the Bidder understand the Initial SRD requirements will be those presented in the SRD in Annex “A” of this RFP. Only after contract award will the selected bidder take part in the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel Inspection, which will add additional requirements to the Initial SRD as described in the SOW.

Finally, it is imperative that the bidder understand that their bid must reflect the effort to produce NLTs that meet the Final SRD requirements. This will necessitate the Bidder be very familiar with the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel so that they can accurately bid the cost to manufacture like vessels in terms of as-built construction, systems and capabilities.

Please clarify what design of vessel the bidder is to quote for. Is the bid price to be based solely on the Initial SRD or is it required to include the cost and schedule necessary to build & deliver a vessel that will meet the Final SRD?

**A.6.** The Proven Parent Design is the basis of the Naval Large Tug design. The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel is the construction baseline of the Naval Large Tug, providing the level of outfit and furnishing as well as performance required in the Naval Large Tug. The Final SRD is the Initial SRD with the addition of those aspects of the Proven Parent Design and Proven Parent In-Service Vessel that will be monitored and assessed throughout the NLT contract to ensure that the NLT will perform to the capabilities of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel. The bid price must reflect the cost to build and deliver four (4) Naval Large Tugs that meet the Final SRD.

**Q.7. RFP - 7.39.2 Economic LEVERAGING Obligation**

1. For each year during the term of the Contract:
  - a. at least 90% of the workforce carrying out the Work must be Canadian; and
  - b. at least 30% of the materials and equipment used in carrying out the Work must contain Canadian Content.

**FROM THE SOW**

**From Annex A definitions: Work:** All engineering and shipbuilding effort and activities as defined by the Contract to be carried out by the Contractor to construct and deliver the NLTs.

- A) *Please clarify what the definition of Canadian is as it is used in this RFP.*
- B) *Please clarify where the remaining 10% of the workforce must be located when they complete any of the Work required for this contract.*
- C) *Please confirm that the definition of the term Work as it appears in the Statement of Work will be applied to the definition of the same term used in 7.39.2 Economic LEVERAGING Obligation of the RFP?*

**A.7.** A) For the purposes of Article 7.39 in the RFP, Economic Leveraging, "Canadian" means Canadian citizens, and permanent residents as defined in the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act 2001*, c.27.

B) All (100%) of the labour must be completed/done in Canada. Note: up to 10% of the workforce could be foreign workers (non- Canadian) working in Canada.

C)- Yes, that is correct.

**Q.8. At 1.3 Objective**

Any performance capabilities, design and construction features present in the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel that Canada and the Contractor jointly agree to must also be carried over into the NLT and will be monitored by adding requirements to the Initial SRD, forming the Final SRD.

Please clarify what the term 'carried over' means in the context of this RFP?

**A.8.** Carried over in this context means that any performance capabilities, design and construction features present in the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel that Canada and the Contractor jointly agree to must also be delivered in the NLT.

**Q.9. At 2.2.6 Proven Parent In-Service Vessel Inspection**

**2.2.6.1 General**

During the PPIVI the representatives of Canada will verify that each of the Initial SRD requirements, less the Canadian regulatory requirements, are met by the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel. Additionally, during the inspection of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel, Canada's representatives will assess the performance capabilities and design features of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel. This assessment will permit Canada to develop the additional requirements for the NLT that reflect the performance capabilities and design features of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel. These additional requirements will be agreed to by Canada and the Contractor and will be added to the Initial SRD, creating the Final SRD.

Referring to the italicized section of above paragraph when and how will these additional requirements be incorporated in the contract?

**A.9.** The Initial SRD will be updated to the Final SRD through a no-cost contract amendment, reflecting the outcome of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel Inspection.

**Q.10. At 2.2.6.2 Conduct**

Following the Contract Kick-off Meeting the Contractor must arrange and facilitate the PPIVI, which must be conducted within two (2) months of contract award. Canada must be provided details of the PPIVI no more than five (5) Working Days after contract award in order to coordinate and make travel arrangements. The Contractor must make all arrangements for access to, and availability of, the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel for the purposes of the PPIVI. Arrangements must include the provision for up to five (5) personnel representing Canada to have complete access to the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel, along with representatives of the Contractor as required.

The PPIVI must provide for five (5) contiguous days of uninterrupted access to the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel for inspection by Canada. Each day must include no less than three (3) hours of access to the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel followed by no more than four (4) hours of meeting time between the Contractor and Canada. This meeting time is to discuss and agree on the additional requirements for the NLT that reflect the features of the as-built construction, systems and capabilities of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel that the Contractor is responsible to deliver in the NLT. The Contractor must make all arrangements for the conduct of the meeting time during the PPIVI including arranging the facilities and taking minutes.

Does Canada expect the PPISV to be operational during this 5 day period and actually proceed to sea with additional personnel on board? Such activity will require additional lifesaving preparations, certificates and the like. Please clarify Canada's expectations.

Providing 5 contiguous days of access to the vessel when only 3 hours a day of true access is required needs further explanation. We assume the requisite meetings can take place ashore and recognizing these vessels will operate effectively around the clock please confirm the actual duration of each day that the PPISV needs to be made available to Canada.

**A.10.** The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel Inspection will be conducted alongside, no provision for taking the vessel to sea is required.

Understanding that the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel is an operating vessel, Canada requires that it be made available for joint inspection for three (3) hours each day for five (5) contiguous days. Following each daily inspection, Canada and the Contractor will meet to review the elements of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel that were examined that day.

**Q.11. At 2.2.7.2 Preliminary Design Review (PDR)**

During the Preliminary Design Phase, the Contractor must examine every aspect of the design, construction and outfitting of the Proven Parent Design and carry out the necessary preliminary design and engineering work in order to rectify any discrepancies between the Proven Parent Design and the requirements of Canada as set out in the Final SRD.

*The use of term ‘must examine every aspect of the design’ implies a far more complete stage of detailed design than is normal practice. Elsewhere in the SOW the minimum work to be completed for the PDR is defined more clearly. Please clarify Canada’s requirements for the scope of work to be completed for PDR.*

**A.11.** The scope of work for the Preliminary Design Phase will include examining the design, construction and outfitting of the Proven Parent Design, completion of the necessary preliminary design and engineering work to rectify any discrepancies between the Proven Parent Design and the requirements of Canada as set out in the Final SRD. The deliverables to be completed for this Phase are identified in the Preliminary Design Data Package. Further detailed design is to be completed in the Critical Design Phase.

**Q.12. At 3.1 061 Hull Structure**

The Contractor must prepare and submit the Bridge Arrangement in accordance with CDRL-E-005 and DID-E-005 for Canada’s review and acceptance.

**Question**

Please confirm if this definition of is accurate or possibly a typo. From our point of view the Bridge Arrangement is not part of hull structure. Please clarify Canada’s intent

**A.12.** The heading “Hull Structure” is a Ship Work Breakdown Structure designation used only for formatting requirements within the SRD document and is not intended to define the content of the Bridge Arrangement drawing. Bridge Arrangement drawing requirements shall be as per the applicable CRDL/DID.

**Q.13. At NLTP-460** The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must achieve a minimum free-running speed of 12 knots in a fully loaded, deep departure condition, in calm water.

Please confirm what engine MCR can be used to attain the required minimum free running speed

**A.13.** 100% engine MCR may be used to achieve the minimum free running speed.

**Q.14.**

a. Proven Parent Design Information

As a minimum, the following technical information with reference to the Proven Parent Design must be submitted;

- 1) Build specification, construction drawings (Classification Society approved design drawings) and a major equipment list (identifying all the major components of the propulsion system, electrical power and generation system, auxiliary systems, deck equipment and towing equipment);
- 2) General Arrangement drawing (Classification Society approved);
- 3) Trim and Stability Manual;
- 4) Trials Report containing a minimum of speed and power curve;
- 5) Major structural construction plans;
- 6) Fuel Consumption and Endurance Calculations; and
- 7) Tank Plan and Capacities.

General Arrangement drawings are not normally approved by Class. Such drawings most commonly just noted and filed. Please amend Canada's requirements

**A.14.** Canada agrees to modify the General Arrangement drawing to remove the requirement for this drawing to be Classification Society approved.

In Annex G, Table 2 – Technical Bid Evaluation Matrix

DELETE:

- a.) Proven Parent Design Information
- 2) General Arrangement drawing (Classification Society approved)

ADD:

- a.) Proven Parent Design Information
- 2) General Arrangement drawing

**Q.15.**

b. Proven Parent In-Service Vessel

The Bidder must provide the following information with respect to the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel;

- 1.) Owner contact information: name of company, name of point of contact;
- 2.) Operator contact information, if different than owner: name of operating company, name of point of contact;
- 3.) Name of vessel and IMO hull number, as applicable;

- 4.) Vessel location: Country, City, port of operation, as applicable;
- 5.) Copy of Classification Society Certificate;
- 6.) Proof that the vessel was built in the last 10 years;
- 7.) Proof that the vessel has a minimum of a 1000 operating hours;
- 8.) Proof that the vessel has been operating successfully in a coastal maritime environment.
- 9.) *Proof that the vessel has known and documented hydrodynamic and maneuvering characteristics capable of being demonstrated by sea trials; and*
- 10.) Proof that the vessel is situated in a location that is not under a Government of Canada Travel Advice and Advisories notice of the level “avoid non-essential travel” or higher for the country or the region of the country in which the vessel is located.

*Please clarify Canada’s intent regarding Item 9 above. Are sea trials of the PPISV required or will sea trials of the NLT suffice?*

**A.15.** Sea Trials of the PPISV are not required to be conducted as part of this solicitation. However, Trials Reports containing documented information and results of original sea trials from the PPISV is required as objective evidence as part of the Bid Evaluation and as indicated in Annex G of the RFP.

**Q.16. From the SRD**

NLTP – 447 and NLTP - 1616 The NLT shall have an adequate system of fenders to prevent structural damage and markings to thin hulled naval ships/vessels during berthing/un-berthing operations.

*Can Canada quantify this with a design fender pressure? Can Canada define any specific underwater fender requirements for submarines?*

**A.16.** The fender design of the NLT is the responsibility of the Contractor and will be determined by the vessels Bollard Pull and the hull configuration. NLT will perform only towing operations of the submarines, therefore there are no specific underwater fendering requirements to be fitted on the NLT in support of submarines.

**Q.17. From the SRD**

NLTP – 467 The NLT shall have the fresh water storage capacity and the required pumps and fittings to be able to transfer a minimum of 10 tonnes of potable water, from its own storage tanks, to the DRDC research barge (YR494) and ships/vessels within close proximity of Esquimalt or Halifax harbours per visit.

NLTP – 2225 The NLT should have the fresh water storage capacity and the required pumps and fittings to be able to transfer a minimum of 20 tonnes of potable water, from its own storage tanks, to the DRDC research barge (YR494) and ships/vessels within close proximity of Esquimalt or Halifax harbours per visit.

*As these two clauses conflict, please confirm if the desired total capacity is 20 tonnes of potable water. Please provide the required time to transfer the potable water.*

**A.17.** The NLT must meet the requirements of NLTP-467 and this requirement must be present in the PPISV. However, it is not mandatory that the NLT meet the requirement of NLTP-2225, this is a desirable requirement.

The time required to transfer the 20 tonnes of potable water is 1.5 hours.



**Q.18. From the SRD**

NLTP – 508 The NLT shall be fitted with a firefighting outfit of fire pumps, fire monitors, and water tanks, and other required equipment which conforms to the FFV 1 or equivalent notation.

*Please confirm that no AFF foam tank capacity is required.*

**A.18.** With respect to NLTP-508, Canada confirms that only the equipment as specified by the Classification Society FFV1 or equivalent notation is required.

**Q.19. From the SRD**

NLTP – 2133 The NLT shall comply with STAB 3 from TP 7301 and the Canada Shipping Act 2001, “Hull Construction Regulations”, C.R.C., c1431 (PART VIII Ships Built or Converted for Towing).

*In all of our experience is that Hull Construction Regulations, for Part VIII, Paragraph 104 is very difficult to meet. “Every new ship with openings in the main deck aft of the engine room that are capable of causing down flooding shall be designed and constructed so that, in any operating condition, positive buoyancy and stability are retained and no part of the main deck is submerged when any one watertight compartment aft of the engine room is flooded.” This has been interpreted to mean the compartment is filled from above, not simply damaged. In particular, Z-drive compartments that are assumed to be flooded can immerse the main deck. If the Z-drive compartment is divided transversely on centreline, heel will usually immerse the main deck.*

*Will Canada require bidders to show that the parent design is capable of meeting this difficult criteria or with limited modifications to the Parent vessel?*

**A.19.** Within the SRD this requirement, NLTP-2133, is specified as being “NLT” meaning it is not required that the Parent vessel meet the requirement. This requirement must be met by the final delivered NLT and therefore, the Parent vessel may be modified if required in order to meet NLTP-2133.

**Q.20. From the SRD**

NLTP – 1445 The deck crane shall be electro-hydraulically operated, be able to reach the main working deck, and have sufficient reach to:

- deploy fuel spill response equipment over the gunwales, and
- be capable of loading and off-loading light cargo when the NLT is alongside dock, and
- launch and recover the NLT's Rescue Boat.

*Please confirm the weight of “light cargo” or confirm if “light cargo” is less than the weight of a typical Rescue boat*

**A.20.** Yes, the light cargo will be less than a typical Rescue Boat.

**Q.21. From the SRD**

NLTP – 373 6.7.2.2.1 582.2.1 Hawser/Towing Winches

*Will Canada provide the towing wire and synthetic towing rope? Please provide the required diameter and length of towing wire for coastal towing to be accommodated on the towing winch? Please provide the required diameter and length of synthetic towing rope to be accommodated on the ship docking winch?*

NLTP – 1475 All winch cables to be fitted with tow hooks capable of absorbing the maximum bollard pull with a minimum safety factor of 2.5.

NLTP – 2090 The tow hook shall have an automatic release and be provided with a built in shock absorber.

*Please clarify this item, we do not understand the wording as written.*

**A.21.** Canada will not be providing the towing wire or the synthetic towing rope.

It is the responsibility of the Contractor to provide the appropriate towing wire and/or the synthetic towing rope of sufficient diameter and length to allow the NLT to perform the operations as described in the SRD.

Canada confirms the following modifications for NLTP-1475 and NLTP-2090;

NLTP-1475 All winch cables to be fitted with an eye splice and be capable of absorbing the maximum bollard pull with a minimum safety factor of 2.5.

NLTP – 2090 A deck mounted tow hook with swivel capability and a quick release mechanism shall be fitted.

**Q.22.** *We have been unable to locate current copies of these documents on line. Please provide a copy of the most recent version as is applicable to this RFP and resulting contract*

*CFTO C-03-001-024/MS-006 The Production of Stability Books for Canadian Forces Surface Ship*

*CFTO D-01-400-001/SG-000 Standard Engineering Drawing Practices*

*CFTO D-01-400-002/SF-000 Specification for Levels of Engineering Drawings and Associated Lists*

*CFTO D-03-003-024/SG-001, Work Breakdown Structure for Canadian Forces Ships and Submarines*

**A.22.** PSPC will provide copies of these documents for release to the Bidders. Please see the attachment of these requested documents.

**Q.23.** Page 98 “The Contractor must have in place, or implement and maintain a Quality Management System (QMS) that ensures conformance to contractual requirements and is consistent with the 2015 version of the ISO 9001:2015 Quality Management Systems - Guidelines for Quality Plans standard.”

*Question: Does this mean that the Contractor must have a ISO 9001:2015 QMS in place after Contract award, or planned to be implemented after award, or has a QMS that is similar to the intent and scope of ISO 9001:2015?*

**A.23.** The Quality Management System consistent with ISO 9001:2015 must be in place prior to the commencement of the work of the Contract, and be maintained throughout the Contract. The Quality Management System must be in accordance with ISO 9001:2015 but ISO certification is not required.

**Q.24.** Page 298 Appendix A - Mandatory Evaluation Criteria - Technical Bid (Section I)

NLTP-451 The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must have seamless, uninterrupted, thrust vectors when changing the thrust direction through a full 360 degrees.

NLTP-452 The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must have the ability to turn itself on its own position ("on the spot") without creeping, or scribing an arc through the water in 25 knot winds and 2 knot current acting in any direction.

NLTP-453 The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must have the ability to manoeuvre sideways ("sidestepping") along a line of bearing, on any axis, with the operator having simultaneous and continuous control over the NLT's heading, headway and sternway.

Objective evidence required to prove compliance: Trials report for performance verification of Proven Parent In-Service Vessel

Question: None of the above requirements form a typical sea trials report for any vessel. Will Canada accept (a) videos of the Proven Parent vessel demonstrating these behaviours (b) notarized statements from Masters of the Proven Parent vessel confirming that the vessel can perform in these ways (c) demonstration during the Proven Parent Inspection after Contract award?

**A.24.** Canada confirms that notarized statements from the Masters of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel confirming that the vessel can meet the performance requirements of NLTP-451, NLTP-452 and NLTP-453 is acceptable objective evidence to prove performance compliance.

**Q.25. From the SRD**

NLTP -464 The NLT shall be capable of Conducting out-of harbour coastal towing of an MCDV (1000 tonne displacement, 56 m) up to 750 nautical miles from home port in Sea State 3.

*No speed requirement is stated for the above towing requirement. Please clarify if there is a speed requirement associated with this requirement or is it allowable for the Contractor to fulfil this requirement at any speed they choose.*

**A.25.** NLTP-464 has been modified to include a speed requirement as follows;

NLTP-464 The NLT shall be capable of Conducting out-of harbour coastal towing at a speed of not less than 6 knots of an MCDV (1000 tonne displacement, 56 m) up to 750 nautical miles from home port in Sea State 3.

**Q.26.** With regards to DID-CM-001 Compliance Verification Matrix can Canada provide the exhaustive list of each specific requirement within the Naval Large Tug Final Systems Requirement Documents (SRD) for which the Contractor must identify the objective evidence in the form of a provided deliverable that demonstrates that the requirement has been met by the design?

Please provide example of what objective evidence Canada will consider to be compliant to demonstrate the following (NLTP – 488) requirement has been met by the design:

- The NLT shall have a hull plate thickness with any proposed hull corrosive protection system to meet the 25-year service life requirement.

**A.26.** The intent of DID-CM-001 is for the Contractor to demonstrate to Canada that their NLTs will meet the requirements laid out in the Final SRD. In order to do so, it is the Contractor's responsibility to populate each SRD requirement with their proposed objective evidence for Canada's review and acceptance.

**Q.27.** With regards to DID-CM-001 Compliance Verification Matrix requirement 3.0 : In addition to the specific requirements within the Final SRD, the Contractor must also demonstrate compliance, in the Compliance Verification Matrix, with Transport Canada Regulatory Regime or Class requirements that amplify or govern Final SRD requirements. Does a class approved drawing package would be considered a satisfactory demonstration or each single applicable rules would need to be put into a Compliance Verification Matrix supported by objective evidence in the form of a provided deliverable?

**A.27.** Where a Class-approved drawing package demonstrates compliance with a number of underlying individual rules, the drawing package may be used as the single element in the Compliance Verification Matrix.

**Q.28.** Due to a large volume of RFP's that we are currently working on and the time of year with many taking holidays etc. I would like to request an extension to the closing date. We would request the closing be extended to 10-31-2018.

**A.28.** The request for a bid extension remains unchanged. The bid closing date is August 30<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

**Q.29.** Reference TR-03-519 page 313 of PDF file – The **NLT** should be supplied with all lifesaving and safety equipment necessary to meet TC, SOLAS, and Classification Society requirements. The objective evidence to prove compliance is to provide “Lifesaving and safety equipment key plan (Classification Society approved) “

How can a Bidder provide a class approved plan (*at the time of bid*) if the NLT tug has not yet been designed? The Proven Parent Vessel may be designed to another flag state requirement which will have different safety equipment requirements, or a different number of crew, which would change the number of lifejackets, immersion suits, life raft size, etc.

**A.29.** Reference TR-03-519. Within Annex G, for the Technical Point Rated Evaluation Criteria contained in Table 5 – Vessel Technical Requirements, these are mandatory design and performance requirements for the final configuration of Canada's NLT in that the delivered tugs must meet all of these regardless of whether they are featured in the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel at time of bidding.

It is not mandatory for the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel to meet these requirements at the time of bid submission. However, for purposes of the Bid Evaluation, points will be awarded, if at time of bid, the Bidder can demonstrate that the proposed Proven Parent In-Service Vessel meets the requirements.

**Q.30.** Reference NLTP – 1055 Page 262 of PDF File - Uninterruptible Power Supplies (UPS) shall be provided for essential systems, including .... NLT requirement

Reference NLTP – 1056 Page 262 of PDF File - The Uninterruptible Power Supplies shall be designed for an input voltage of the primary power system. P requirement

Since the requirement to fit a UPS is only a NLT requirement, is the next requirement that UPS be designed for the input voltage of the primary power system be also a NLT requirement rather than a P requirement?

**A.30.** Reference NLTP – 1056. Canada confirms the modification of NLTP – 1056 to be an NLT requirement.

**Q.31.** Reference NLTP – 2282 Page 267 of PDF File - One recording type depth finder providing accurate depth indication shall be provided. P requirement

We do not understand why the Proven Parent Vessel needs to have a recording type depth finder (many tugs have a depth finder but not a recording type one). Could this requirement be replaced by the Proven Parent Vessel only needing a depth sounder to demonstrate that one is successfully installed and the NLT requiring a recording type?

**A.31.** Reference NLTP – 2282. Canada confirms the modification of NLTP – 2282 to be an NLT requirement.

**Q.32.**Reference NLTP – 2212 Page 268 The NLT shall have, as a minimum, installed telephones on the bridge, gangway areas, cabins, master’s cabin, chief engineer’s cabin, and crew lounge. P requirement

We do not understand why the Proven Parent Vessel needs this. Could this be changed to require it to be fitted to the NLT only?

**A.32.** Reference NLTP – 2212. Canada confirms the modification of NLTP – 2212 to be an NLT requirement.

**Q.33.** NLTP – 1617 The fendering shall be non-marking. P requirement. It is unlikely that fenders for existing commercial service tugs will be non-marking. Can this requirement be changed to NLT?

**A.33.** Reference NLTP – 1617. Canada confirms the modification of NLTP – 1617 to be an NLT requirement.

**Q.34.** Upon reviewing the final RFP it is apparent that a number of different but equally proven tug designs will meet the SRD requirements. Based on the weighting of the possible points in the defined evaluation criteria of 70% for cost and 30% on everything else including the vessel design which is only worth 27% of the 30 points or about 8% of the total evaluation criteria is it correct to assume that Canada is primarily looking for the lowest cost parent design vessel that just meets the SRD?

**A.34.** Canada confirms that selection of the winning bid will be in accordance with the details in the RFP, paragraph 4.3, Basis of Selection.

**Q.35.** Is it acceptable and is there any point in providing more than one proposal that offer different designs such as a more capable vessel but at a higher cost to Canada? It is likely that the lowest cost parent design that will meet the SRD will be smaller than the existing Glenn Class vessels. Is a smaller vessel acceptable to Canada if it meets the SRD?

**A.35.** Any bidder may submit more than one bid. However, each bid must be fully compliant with the requirements of the RFP.

The NLT must meet all the technical, operational and performance requirements of the SRD. Canada does not have specific dimensional requirements for the NLT except those referenced in NLTP – 445 and NLTP – 446.

**Q.36. At ANNEX G BID EVALUATION MATRICES**

NLTP-1974 The JSS notional particulars are as follows;

- 210m length with 25,200 tonne displacement;
- Estimated wind area above the design waterline 3,500m<sup>2</sup>
- Estimated underwater area below design waterline 1,450m<sup>2</sup>

The vessel will have two conditions (light and fully loaded). These two conditions have different wind areas and underwater areas which give different total forces.

Can Canada provide wind areas and underwater areas for typical light and fully loaded conditions so bollard pull be properly calculated? Please confirm that 25,200 tonnes is the full load displacement of the JSS? Please confirm if the areas are at full load or light load or some combination?

**A.36.** Canada confirms that JSS finalized design parameters are not available for release. Please see the response to Q.38 for additional clarification.

**Q.37. From the SRD**

NLTP – 446 The NLT shall be capable of operating under the hull flare of all current and future RCN vessel classes.

Can Canada provide hull lines drawings (preferably in Autocad format) of current and future JSS vessel so bidders can confirm this requirement?

**A.37.** Canada confirms that JSS documentation is not available for release. Bidders may submit a request for drawings detailing the hull flare of specific current RCN vessel(s) through the Contracting Authority. Full Lines Plans of existing RCN vessels are not available for release.

**Q.38. From the SRD**

NLTP -448 The Bollard Pull of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must be sufficient for two of them to be able to cold move a JSS-sized ship in the confines of Halifax and Esquimalt harbours, in sustained winds of 25 knots from any direction and in currents of up to 2 knots in any direction.

NLTP -1974 The JSS notional particulars are as follows;

- 210m length with 25,200 tonne displacement;
- Estimated wind area above the design waterline 3,500m<sup>2</sup>
- Estimated underwater area below design waterline 1,450m<sup>2</sup>

*A wide array of standards and methods exist for determining the environmental forces experienced by a vessel while being berthed. As the requirement to move a JSS sized ship has the potential to determine the tug's required bollard pull and therefore propulsion power and subsequently significantly effect the build cost will Canada agree that all bidders are to prove compliance through a common standard? Unless Canada has another preference it is suggested that "**Wind and Current Forces on Canadian Forces Ships During Tug Operations November 2002**" produced by Defence R&D Canada - Atlantic be utilized with stated maximum forces for the fully loaded AOR in these environmental conditions be scaled to the estimated windage areas of the JSS.*

**A.38.** Canada acknowledges the confusion generated by the specification of a minimum Bollard Pull requirement, the maneuvering based on the definition of a vessel above and underwater area in specific environmental conditions, and not identifying a common standard to be utilized for the calculations.

Additionally, the vessel particulars identified for JSS have been found to be in error. Canada recognizes that the combination of these requirements and particular assumptions that Bidders would have had to make regarding coefficients of drag for the stipulated vessel will result in Bidders being unable to ensure that they have in fact proposed a vessel with a Bollard Pull which meets Canada's requirements.

As the JSS final design particulars are not available for release, and to ensure clarity and fairness, Canada has calculated the minimum Bollard Pull. To this end, Canada provides the following corrections and modifications to the SRD at Annex A of the RFP;

NLTP – 448 The tested Bollard Pull of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel shall be at least 50 tonnes.

NLTP – 450 The minimum Bollard Pull for the NLT shall be at least 50 tonnes.

DELETE: NLTP – 1974

Additionally, Canada provides the following modifications to Annex G, Table 1 – Technical Compliance Matrix;

NLTP – 448 The tested Bollard Pull of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel shall be at least 50 tonnes.  
Objective Evidence required to prove compliance

DELETE: NLTP -1974

**Q.39.** Annex A System Requirements Document 3. Definitions states: "Within Table 5 and contained in the column titled "Parent and NLT Specific" are the following identifiers:

p: Indicates those technical, operational, system and performance requirements which must be present in the selected Proven Parent In-Service Vessel.

*Many NLTP items are general instructions or contractual items, but are identified as "p" in Table 5. For example, NLTP 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, etc. are for information and therefore cannot be satisfied by the PPISV itself.*

*Secondly, can Canada please clarify how the "p" items will be utilized by Canada evaluating the bid, if at all, as the number of NLTPs listed in Annex G: Appendix B are significantly less than those identified in Annex A System Requirements Document.*

**A.39.** Canada confirms the following correction to the text of the SRD;

Annex A System Requirements Document 3. Definitions states: "Within the Table contained in 4. System Requirements and contained in the column titled "Parent and NLT Specific" are the following identifiers:

p: Indicates those technical, operational, system and performance requirements which must be present in the selected Proven Parent In-Service Vessel.

Canada acknowledges that some of the requirements in the SRD are general statements such as NLTP-390 through to and including NLTP-394.

The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must meet all those technical, operational, system and performance requirements in the SRD which are designated as "p" and these must be present in the PPISV identified



by the Bidder and must be present in the NLT when delivered. However, for the purposes of the bid submissions and bid evaluation, only a portion of the “p” requirements have been selected to be evaluated and are those contained in Annex G, Table 1 – Technical Compliance Matrix.

**Q.40.** Ref NLTP 448 and NLTP 1974: please confirm bollard pull calculation for min 2x 62t BP;

*Ref NLTP 450: we read a minimum requirement for 40t BP. To secure the new NLT's meet your requirement as per NLTP 448 and NLTP1874, and subsequent shipyard technical proposals are equally capable, as well as to secure fair and competitive shipyard pricing, we kindly request an amendment of NLTP 450 as per below.*

Ref NLTP 450: please advise if this is to be amended considering bollard pull calculation for min 62t BP per tug;

Ref NLTP 448: please advise whether confines of Halifax harbor and JSS dimensions require any transverse bollard pull capability;

Ref NLTP 452: please advise how this (parent design) criteria is to be demonstrated in the technical bid;

Ref NLTP 453: please advise if this is under tow, or free-sailing;

**A.40.** Ref NLTP-450 Canada has modified the minimum Bollard Pull requirement to 50 tonnes. Please see the response to Q.38 for additional clarification.

Ref NLTP-448 Canada does not require confirmation of the transverse Bollard Pull capability of the NLT.

Ref NLTP 452 Canada confirms the following modification; Notarized statements from the Masters of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel confirming that the vessel can meet the performance requirements of NLTP-451, NLTP-452 and NLTP-453 is acceptable objective evidence to prove performance compliance.

Ref NLTP 453 the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must meet the requirement in a free-sailing condition.

**Q.41.** Refers to SRD, NLTP 499 and NLTP 504

Variations in voltages and system frequency are common in different countries. There is little technical difference in complexity between similar voltages, therefore can the Proven Parent Vessel have a 380V/50 Hz 3 phase or a 480V or 440V/60 Hz 3 phase electrical system rather than a 'minimum' of a 400V/60Hz 3 phase system? For the NLT design is Canada truly willing to accept a minimum 400v system if one can be found?

**A.41.** Reference NLTP – 499 and NLTP – 504. Canada confirms that the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel may have a 380V/50 Hz 3 phase electrical system. However, the NLT must meet the requirements of NLTP-499 and NLTP – 504. To clarify, a 440V/60 Hz 3 phase electrical system and a 480V/ 60 Hz 3 phase electrical system meet the minimum 400V/60Hz 3 phase electrical system requirement.

The following requirement has been added to the SRD contained in Annex A;

NLTP – 2295 All NLT equipment shall be selected and fitted to operate using the power inputs defined in NLTP-504.



**Q.42.** Reference TR-02-478, page 313 of PDF File, Description and drawing of pilot transfer arrangement; Description of operating procedure for pilot ladder.

Can Canada provide more details on the boarding platform (either a drawing of existing Glenn class system or description of how system is to work)? In particular how is the boarding platform to reach down to the deck of a submarine or to a pilot boarding ladder or opening pilot door on the JSS?

**A.42.** Canada expects that for higher decked vessels the pilot will be required to step from the NLT onto a pilot ladder lowered from the receiving vessel, at present RCN does not have pilot doors on any existing vessels. For lower freeboard vessels the pilot currently steps up or down to the deck of the receiving vessel (as determined by the relative difference in height). The NLT arrangement for embarking/disembarking a pilot between a NLT and warship must satisfy applicable Canadian safety standards.

**Q.43.** Reference TR-01-416 page 313 of PDF file. The NLT should have American Bureau of Shipping ACCU or the equivalent notation from another Classification Society recognized under Transport Canada's Delegated Statutory Inspection Program.

The ABS unmanned machinery space designation for a vessel < 500 Gross Tons is ABCU. Recognizing that the NLT will most likely be less than 500 GT can Canada accept ABCU notation for the NLT of < 500 Gross Tons? Please also refer to the requirements of NLTP 495 and NLTP 496.

**A.43.** Canada confirms the following modifications;

Reference NLTP – 416 of the Annex A, SRD. The requirement has been modified as follows:

NLTP -416. The NLT shall have American Bureau of Shipping ABCU or the equivalent notation from another Classification Society recognized under Transport Canada's Delegated Statutory Inspection Program.

Reference TR-01-416, Annex G, Table 5 – Vessel Technical Requirements has been modified to reflect the notation change cited in NLTP – 416. The Description of Requirement has been modified as follows:

TR-01-416. The NLT shall have American Bureau of Shipping ABCU or the equivalent notation from another Classification Society recognized under Transport Canada's Delegated Statutory Inspection Program.

**Q.44.** Reference: NLTP – 1459 All towing equipment and lines shall be of size and length suitable for the maximum tow defined. P Requirement

Can Canada suggest a criteria for line length for the maximum tow? The Parent Vessel may not have lines suitable in length for coastal towing to suit Canada's specific warship towing requirements.

**A.44.** Canada confirms the following modifications;

Reference NLTP-1459 modified to a NLT requirement.

Reference NLTP-1471 modified to a NLT requirement.

Additionally, Canada confirms the following additions to the SRD as NLT requirements;

NLTP-2297 The line length for the maximum tow shall be 1000m.

NLTP-2298 All synthetic line and/or wire rope shall be of sufficient diameter for the rated bollard pull of the NLT and have a minimum safety factor of 2.5.

**Q.45. 2.2.7.3 Critical Design Review (CDR)**

On completion of the Critical Design phase, the Contractor must obtain formal approval of the NLT design from the Classification Society and must then deliver the Critical Design Review (CDR) Data Package in accordance with CDRL-E-007 and DID-E-007 for Canada's review.

The SOW requirement to obtain Classification Approval of the CDR Data package prior to the actual CDR meeting will significantly lengthen the design process and create a high degree of risk of significant schedule slippage affecting the scheduling of the CDR meeting itself and the subsequent planned start of construction. Most Class Societies will not commit to a specific review period and do not normally meet any promised delivery date that they do predict. This matter is widespread among the Societies and universally well known in industry. Normal approval time predictions are at least 6 to 8 weeks from receipt of the drawing package by Class. In this situation the project effectively stops for up to 2 months or longer while Class does their review. Will Canada reconsider this requirement and require only that the required drawing package be submitted to Class thereby allowing Class review to run in parallel with the CDR process?

**A.45.** Canada confirms that no modifications will be made to the CDR process as defined in the RFP.

**Q.46.** Concerning System Requirements Document item NLTP-448, can Canada inform if the following interpretation is accurate: The Bollard Pull of the Proven parent In-service Vessel must be sufficient for two of them to be able to cold move a JSS-size ship in the confines of Halifax and Esquimalt harbours, in sustained beam (from one side) winds of 25 knots and in beam (from same side) currents of up to 2 knots?

**A.46.** NLTP-448 has been modified. Please refer to response for Q.38.

**Q.47.** Concerning System Requirements Document item NLTP-1974, please provide clarification for the two following definitions:

2.1 - Estimated wind area above the design waterline 3,500m<sup>2</sup>

2.2 - Estimated underwater area below design waterline 1,450m<sup>2</sup>

Should the two areas above be interpreted as only the projected side areas above and below waterline?

**A.47.** NLTP-1974 has been deleted. Please refer to response for Q.38.

**Q.48.** Concerning System Requirements Document item NLTP-450, can Canada confirm that the required minimum Bollard Pull for the NLT of at least 40 tons each is sufficient to meet the requirement of NLTP-448 and NLTP-1974? If not, what is to be considered the minimum Bollard Pull per Tug?

**A.48.** NLTP-450 has been modified. Please refer to response to Q.38.

**Q.49.** The need for training material in both English and French is not clear.

- Section 2.2.8 Language, 1st sentence states "The Contractor must produce all documentation consistently in one of the two Official Languages of Canada unless specified otherwise."

- DID-T-001 Training Plan, Item 2.0 under Preparation Instructions states “All Contractor supplied training and the training material must be provided in English and French.” Please confirm that the training and training material need to be in English and French, i.e. this is an exception. Where do we stop with the translation? For example if equipment operation manuals are used during the training and they are available only in one of the official languages, do we need to translate them?

**A.49.** Canada confirms that the training and contractor produced training material is an exception and must be provided in English and French. Equipment operation manuals reproduced and bound into the training material are not the responsibility of the bidder to translate if they are unavailable in both English and French. As per section 2.2.8 of the SOW: “If bilingual documentation is not provided from the supplier or OEM, the Contractor should obtain a written authorization from the supplier or OEM in question to grant Canada the rights to translate into the other official language.”

**Q.50.** The warranty period for each Vessel is twelve (12) months from the date of its delivery to and acceptance by Canada. However, the warranty period for each hull is two (2) years from the date of the Vessel's delivery to and acceptance by Canada. For each of the vessels, the entire mechanical and electrical components of the power train, power train resilient mountings and any sub-bases incorporated into the propulsion engine or gearing arrangements shall have a 2-year warranty which commences from acceptance of the vessel by Canada.

*Please define the word “hull” as used in this clause.*

**A.50.** Canada confirms that “hull” is defined as per CFTO D-03-003-024/ SG-001 Work Breakdown Structure for Canadian Forces Ships and Submarines.

**Q.51. At Section 4.1.2 Eligible Mandatory Evaluation Criteria**

**4.1.2.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria and Mandatory Management Criteria**

The Phased Bid Compliance Process will apply to all Mandatory Technical Criteria outlined in:

- a) Annex « G », Appendix A, Table 1, Technical Compliance Matrix; and
- b) Annex « G », Appendix A, Table 2, Technical Bid Evaluation Matrix.

The Phased Bid Compliance Process will also apply to all Mandatory Management Criteria outlined in:

- a) Annex “G”, Appendix A, Table 3, Boat Construction Experience; and
- b) Annex “G”, Appendix A, Table 4, Other Requirements.

**4.1.2.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria**

**The Phased Bid Compliance Process will apply to all Point Rated criteria outlined in:**

- a) Annex G, Table 6, Boat Construction Experience;
- b) Annex G, Table 7, Construction Infrastructure and Facilities;
- c) Annex G, Table 8, Project Management Team;

- d) Annex G, Table 9, Project Management Plan;
- e) Annex G, Table 10, Master Plan and Schedule; and
- f) Annex G, Table 11, Quality Plan

*The fact that Table 5 of Annex G is omitted from this list is noted. Is this deliberate or inadvertent? If the omission is deliberate please explain why.*

**A.51.** Canada confirms the following correction to the RFP, please insert Table 5 - Vessel Technical Requirements at the following:

**4.1.2.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria**

**The Phased Bid Compliance Process will apply to all Point Rated criteria outlined in:**

- a) Annex G, Table 5, Vessel Technical Requirements;
- b) Annex G, Table 6, Boat Construction Experience;
- c) Annex G, Table 7, Construction Infrastructure and Facilities;
- d) Annex G, Table 8, Project Management Team;
- e) Annex G, Table 9, Project Management Plan;
- f) Annex G, Table 10, Master Plan and Schedule; and
- g) Annex G, Table 11, Quality Plan

**Q.52. At Section 7.33 Preliminary Design Review and Critical Design Review**

Please confirm that the process outlined in this section is expected to happen following both the Preliminary Design Review and the Critical Design Review as implied in 7.33.2

**A.52.** Canada confirms that the requirements of 7.33.2 must be completed only once following completion of both the PDR and CDR.

**Q.53.** Request for bid extension. The NLT are bigger and more complex vessels, it is a design build contract requiring a Parent Vessel with precise requirements and the extended summer break is already very challenging. The 4 months schedule seems more reasonable and realistic if Canada wants multiple competitive bids for the project.

Based on the above, could Canada extend the solicitation to October 31<sup>st</sup> 2018?

**A.53.** Canada confirms the solicitation closing date has been amended, please see Amendment #3 for the bid closing date extension to October 31<sup>st</sup>, 2018.

**Q.54.** Can we offer multiple design options?presented in a separate bid submission.

**A.54.** With respect to Q.54, please refer to the responses for Q.35 and Q.55. Canada confirms that each design option must be presented in a separate bid submission.

**Q.55.** If we can offer multiple design options, should they be presented as individual bids or should they be options in the same bid?

**A.55.** Please see Q&A.35. Any bidder may submit more than one bid. However, each bid must be fully compliant with the requirements of the RFP.

**Q.56. Reference to Q&A #50:** There does not appear to be a clear definition of the word “hull” in the referenced DND Work Breakdown Structure document despite the word being used well over 100 times. Please confirm what portions of the overall NLT the two year warranty requirement is to cover compared to the one year requirement also stated in the same clause.

**A.56.** Canada confirms that “hull” is defined as those items covered under Group 100 as per CFTO D-03-003-024/ SG-001 Work Breakdown Structure for Canadian Forces Ships and Submarines.

**Q.57. Reference:** Annex G Bid Evaluation Matrices Table 10 Master Plan and Schedule and Annex “A” SRD and SOW, CDRL-M-002, DID-M-002 Master Plan and Schedule. Recognizing that the Master Plan & Schedule to be submitted with the bid is worth 30 points and a minimum score of 20 points is required to “pass” the need for an accurate and comprehensive schedule is clearly seen. The various documents that refer to this schedule and especially to the period of time from contract award to the Critical Design Review are not clear to us.

**Question:** As we currently see it:

The Kick Off meeting is to be held within 25 working days of award, and following the Contract Kick-off Meeting the Contractor must arrange and facilitate the PPIVI, which must be conducted within two (2) months of contract award. Following the PPIVI a final SRD is to be produced by DND and agreed with the Contractor. It is not clear when this activity might be completed but it seems that this step happens after the PPIVI. Presumably design work can only start after the final SRD is agreed to. Canada requires 15 working days to review all submissions. Referring to Canada’s Q & A #45 Class approval of all drawings that form part of the CDR must be obtained before the CDR can take place.

Is this an accurate assessment of the key sequential steps Canada requires to take place leading up to the CDR meeting? When should a bidder assume the actual design work related to the NLT program can start?

**A.57.** Canada confirms that the key sequential steps leading up to the CDR are essentially as interpreted by the Bidder and as described above excepting that the PDR must also be completed prior to the CDR meeting as well as the submission of those deliverables described in the SOW and the accompanying CDRL and DIDs.

To ensure a clear understanding, completion and provision of the Final SRD is detailed in paragraph 2.2.6.1 of the SOW.

**Q.58. At section 2.2.6 Proven Parent In-Service Vessel Inspection**

**2.2.6.1 General**

*During the PPISVI the representatives of Canada will verify that each of the Initial SRD requirements, less the Canadian regulatory requirements, are met by the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel. Additionally, during the inspection of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel, Canada's representatives will assess the performance capabilities and design features of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel. This assessment will permit Canada to develop the additional requirements for the NLT that reflect the performance capabilities and design features of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel. These additional requirements will be agreed to by Canada and the Contractor and will be added to the Initial SRD, creating the Final SRD.*

**Question:** Most, if not all, proven parent designs that are suitable for the NLT program exceed the requirements of the existing SRD, especially in the area of bollard pull. Referring to the underlined section above, does Canada expect bidders to assume that the proposed parent design capabilities that exceed the initial SRD requirements to be provided to Canada at no extra cost?

**A.58.** The proposed PPISV must meet the requirements of the Initial SRD with the understanding that some changes will be required to meet Canadian regulations. As described in the RFP at section 2.6 Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS) Basis of NLT, and with respect to the vessel cost, the Bidder must submit a cost based on the proposed Proven Parent In-Service Vessel (including all of its as-built capabilities) plus the costs to incorporate those changes to the PPISV design that are required to meet the requirements of Canadian regulations and the specific technical and performance requirements of Canada as detailed in the Initial SRD as NLT requirements.

**Q.59. Proven Parent In-Service Vessel**

***Proven Parent In-Service Vessel:*** *A vessel built from the Transport Canada Delegated Statutory Inspection Program recognized organization (Classification Society) approved Proven Parent Design which has entered service within the last ten (10) years and is currently In-Service under Transport Canada Delegated Statutory Inspection Program recognized organization (Classification Society) approval.*

**Question:** Referring to the above definition how closely is the final NLT design expected to match the PPISV? For example; is the lines plan of the NLT required to be identical to the PPISV or can it be a geosym of the parent within some % limit (scaled up or down)? The equipment installed in the NLT will be different than that installed in the PPISV. Is this understood by Canada?

**A.59.** Canada expects the NLT final design to be identical to the PPISV in terms of hull geometry, as-built construction, systems and capabilities with the exception of those changes required to meet Canadian regulations and specific technical and performance requirements as detailed in the initial SRD.

The NLT final design cannot be a geosym of the PPISV.

While Canada does not expect the NLT equipment to differ from the PPISV in terms of fit, form and function, Canada does understand that equipment on the NLT may need to deviate from the PPISV in order to address a) Canadian regulations, b) obsolescence issue, or c) the specific technical and performance requirements as detailed in the Initial SRD. It is also understood, by Canada, that should

the Bidders PPISV be selected from a non-North American state some equipment will require model changes to accommodate the changes in electrical power between Canada and the PPISV flag state.

**Q.60. Towing Equipment.** To ensure an even bidding environment, can Canada provide better performance specifications for the towing and hawser winches? For the hawser winch - speed of line retrieval under load, line stowage required, and brake holding are usually a key determinants of winch power and thus cost. For a stern towing winch, line stowage requirements (diameter and length) and brake holding capacity are also important to determine the size and cost of a towing winch.

**A.60.** It is the responsibility of the Bidder to recommend and select the size and type of winches that meet the operational profile and technical requirements defined by Canada. Canada confirms that brake holding capacity for all winches shall be equal to the breaking strain of the line. Further details with respect to this question have been addressed in the responses for Q.21 and Q.44.

**Q.61.** Is there a way to find out what shipyards have requested information for the Naval Large Tugs (W8472-185713/B) project?

**A.61.** The Shipyards that have requested the information on this project is not known at this time, however, Canada does invite you to register your company at the following website under Interested Suppliers: <https://buyandsell.gc.ca/procurement-data/tender-notice/PW-MC-017-26882>

**Q.62.** *Answers A58 and A59 are not entirely clear with regards to changes to the PPISV. If the performance of the PPISV exceeds the specific technical and performance requirements of Canada can the Bidder submit a cost that includes a reduction in the performance of the PPISV to the level that is required to meet the performance requirements of Canada as detailed in the Initial SRD? As an example, if the PPISV has been previously built with 70 tonnes bollard pull, can the bidder propose a cost that reflects a reduction in installed power to a suitable level to meet Canada's stated requirement of 50 tonnes BP while still meeting all other performance requirements such as speed, range, etc.*

**A.62** All systems, equipment, performance capabilities and design features present in the as-built PPISV shall be delivered in the NLT.

Changes to the PPISV are only permissible in order to address a) Canadian regulations, b) equipment obsolescence issues, or c) the specific technical and performance requirements as detailed in the Initial SRD with an "NLT" designation.

**Q.63.** *Is it acceptable for the PPISV to be fitted with a forward winch, aft tow hook, and supporting structure for an aft winch, though not the physical winch, while the proposed NLT configuration of the same vessel would be fitted with forward winch, aft tow hook and aft winch as is required by the SRD? Requiring the PPISV be fitted with fore and aft winches and a tow hook is rare in commercial practice for tugs of this size and would severely limit the potential choices of existing vessels that can be considered.*

**A.63.** Canada confirms that the existing PPISV may be 'fitted for but not with' a towing winch. However, the towing winch shall be selected to meet the operational and technical requirements of the SRD and fitted on the delivered NLT. Note, within the Initial SRD, all requirements that form part of the section related to NLTP-373 Hawser/Towing Winches are applicable to both hawser and towing winches that are fitted and will be required for both types of winches on the NLT.



**Q.64.** NLTP-428, «The diesel engine exhaust emissions using commercial marine diesel shall comply with the requirements of MARPOL, Annex VI Regulations for the Prevention of Air Pollution from Ships and NOX/SOX Technical Code». Our understanding is that the Parent Design must comply to the regulation in force when it was built, i.e. IMO Tier I or II compliant if it was built before 2016. Please confirm that this is correct and acceptable. Please also confirm that the Parent Design will have to be modified to accommodate equipment required for Tier III compliance of the NLT.

**A.64.** Canada acknowledges that Proven Parent Vessels built within the last 10 years may not meet the IMO Tier III requirements and understands that the selected Proven Parent Vessel may have to be modified to meet those specific requirements. As such, Tier III compliance requirements are designated as “NLT” in the Initial SRD.

**Q.65.** Does the value of equipment or materials acquired from an Aboriginal business, but not produced or manufactured by the Aboriginal business, contribute to the achievement of the Aboriginal Participation Component (VPA) requirements, which is the 1% sub-contracting of the total estimated cost of the contract?

**A.65.** The value of equipment or materials acquired from an Aboriginal business, but not produced or manufactured by the Aboriginal business, does contribute to the achievement of the Aboriginal Participation Component requirements.

**Q.66.** If the proposed proven parent vessel is one of a series of identical hulls built with slightly different capabilities can the bidder propose a variant of the proven parent design combining the capabilities required by Canada as mandatory that exist in two or more built sister ships? For example; if one built tug has the installed propulsion power required by Canada but only FFV – ½ and another sister ship has full FFV – 1 but more propulsion power than Canada requires can the bidder offer the design with the appropriate lower power with the FFV system upgraded to FFV-1 as per the higher powered vessel?

**A.66.** Canada confirms that the proposed proven parent design cannot be a variant with combined capabilities that exist in sister ships. The PPISV shall meet all requirements of the SRD designated as ‘p’. Additionally, please refer to the response to Q 62.

**Q.67.** Is there an adjustment mechanism to protect bidders against the increase cost of materials and equipment for this project (Example: steel prices variations)? Considering the fact that it is a long term project, the materials and the equipment cost will increase between bid deposit and last tug built.

**A.67.** Canada has not included any provisions to adjust prices as the result of specific market material or equipment price increases.

**Q.68.** According the incertitude of the markets these days, is there an adjustment mechanism to protect bidders against changes in customs duties?

**A.68.** Canada has not included any provisions to adjust prices for changes in customs duties.

**Q.69.** Recent answers by Canada to Q&A Nos. 58, 59, 62 & 66 all clearly require the Proven Parent Design (PPD) and the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel (PPISV) must meet, in one specific vessel, all of the mandatory criteria identified in the RFP, including amongst other requirements a minimum Bollard pull of 50 tonnes and be fitted with a FFV 1 system. Canada has also clearly stated that no departure from the hull form or capability of the PPISV is allowed. The selected vessel must also be capable of being modified to meet Canadian Rules and the requirements of the Initial SRD. Canada further confirmed that



whatever capabilities that do exist in the PPSIV must be included in the proposal price along with the costs of the required changes to meet Canadian rules and the non-mandatory requirements of initial SRD.

The required minimum bollard pull and the installation of FFV 1 are not normally found in the same vessel as tugs of 50 tonnes BP are seldom used in situations that would justify the FFV 1 requirement. As a result the FFV 1 requirement will be the determining factor in the size and cost of the PPD and PPISV, not the SRD bollard pull. Therefore the designs that will be proposed as the PPD and PPISV will likely be significantly more capable than the initial SRD requires.

Considering the above will Canada consider modifying their requirement to state that PPD and PPISV must be fitted with a Class approved external firefighting system of unspecified capacity while maintaining the SRD requirement for FFV 1? As long as the PPD and PPISV are fitted with a FFV even if it's an FFV ½ on board it can be easily upgraded to FFV 1 without affecting the vessel performance.

**A.69.** Yes, Canada will modify the requirements as follows;

At Annex A, Systems Requirements Document - NLTP-2293.

**Delete:** "(FFV 1) "

At Annex A Systems Requirements Document - NLTP-422.

**Delete:** The NLT shall be fitted with the requisite equipment to conform to Firefighting Vessel 1 (FFV 1) or equivalent notation of a Regulatory Body.

**Insert:** The NLT shall be fitted with a Classification Society or Regulatory Body approved external firefighting system.

At Annex A Systems Requirements Document - NLTP-508. In the 'Parent and NLT specific' column,

**Delete:** "p"

**Insert:** "NLT"

At Annex A Systems Requirements Document - NLTP-552.

**Delete:** The propulsion engines, diesel generators and any FFV 1 diesel pumps shall be fuelled by commercially available diesel fuel.

**Insert:** The propulsion engines, diesel generators and any firefighting diesel pumps shall be fuelled by commercially available diesel fuel.

At Annex A – Systems Requirements Document, insert row in table after row NLTP-2293:

|                  |  |            |
|------------------|--|------------|
| <b>NLTP-2305</b> | <b>The NLT shall be classed as: American Bureau of Shipping FFV 1 or the equivalent notation from another Classification Society recognized under Transport Canada's Delegated Statutory Inspection Program.</b> | <b>NLT</b> |
|------------------|--|------------|

At Annex G, - Table 1 - Technical Compliance Matrix - NLTP-422

**Delete:** The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must be fitted with the requisite equipment to conform to Firefighting Vessel 1 (FFV 1) or equivalent notation of a Regulatory Body.

**Insert:** The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must be fitted with a Classification Society or Regulatory Body approved external firefighting system.

**Delete:** Classification society approved drawings and a description of the fitted equipment to demonstrate the FFV 1 or equivalent notation.

**Insert:** Classification society approved drawings and a description of the fitted equipment.

**Q.70.** In reference to answers Q67 and Q68, will PWGSC consider implementing a mechanism to protect bidders against the mentioned market fluctuations for the duration of the project? We can't safely anticipate material, equipment, and customs duties fluctuations for the upcoming years.

**A.70.** Canada will not include any provisions or mechanisms in the resulting contract to adjust prices for changes in the prices of materials or equipment.

**Q.71.** In reference to NTLP-462, how many hours/year operations are expected for NLT?

**A.71.** Operations for the NLT are expected to be 2000 hours per year.

**Q.72.** Will DND consider accepting a proven parent vessel designed, built, and entered into service within the last 12 year?

**A.72.** Yes, Canada will accept a proven parent vessel designed, built, and entered into service within the last 12 years.

**Q.73.** In the initial Draft RFP documents NLTP 1899 required stowage volume for approximately 2m3 of food stores for the crew of 6 persons over a voyage duration of 10 days. In the actual RFP NLTP 1899 has changed and now requires a stowage volume for approximately 120m3 of food stores, which, given the size of the increase and extremely large volume, is likely the result of a typo as is not a practicable amount of human consumption. Can Canada please revisit this change in NLTP 1899 and change back to something closer to those stated within the RFI. For reference, typically a commercial tug meeting the rest of Canada's requirements would have approximately 8m3 of dedicated food stores onboard.

**A.73.** Canada confirms the following modification to the requirements;

At Annex A Systems Requirements Document - NLTP-1899.

DELETE:

The volume of stores is calculated from the following formula;

Volumetric Requirement = Space Factor x No. of Days x No. of Crew

Volume for provisions store shall be based on space factors as outlined in the table below.

| Category  | Storeroom | Space Factor<br>(per crew/day) |
|-----------|-----------|--------------------------------|
| Provision | Dry       | 0.76552 m <sup>3</sup>         |
|           | Fridge    | 0.85592 m <sup>3</sup>         |
|           | Freezer   | 0.38124 m <sup>3</sup>         |

INSERT:

The minimum volume of actual provisions that the NLT must accommodate is listed in the table below. Note that this is the volume of the provisions themselves, not the space required to accommodate cabinetry or food storage appliances.

| Category  | Storeroom | Volume                 |
|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Provision | Dry       | 0.76552 m <sup>3</sup> |
|           | Fridge    | 0.85592 m <sup>3</sup> |
|           | Freezer   | 0.38124 m <sup>3</sup> |

**Q.74.** NLTP 2005 states that “The mast may be of the folding type to allow the NLT to operate under the flare of warships.” As per Q&A #37 documentation on the hull flare of all RCN vessels is not available, primarily JSS. Can Canada then please confirm whether they will require a folding mast or will accept a fixed mast.

**A.74.** Canada confirms that a folding mast is not a mandatory requirement and that a fixed mast is acceptable provided the NLT is capable of operating under the flare of RCN vessels as per the SRD requirement NLTP-446

#### Clarification #1

Ref Q.14. and A.14. Canada provides the following additional modification:

In Annex G, Table 2 – Technical Bid Evaluation Matrix under the column titled “Description of Mandatory Requirement Technical Bid”:

DELETE:

- a.) Proven Parent Design Information
- 2) General Arrangement drawing (Classification Society approved)

INSERT:

- a.) Proven Parent Design Information
- 2) General Arrangement drawing

#### Clarification #2

Ref Q.38. and A.38. Canada provides the following additional modification:

Canada provides the following additional modifications to Annex G, Table 1 – Technical Compliance Matrix:

With respect to the requirement NLTP – 448 The tested Bollard Pull of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel shall be at least 50 tonnes, under the column titled “Objective Evidence required to prove compliance”:

**DELETE:**

Bollard Pull calculation for the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel; and  
Trials report for Proven Parent In-Service Vessel to demonstrate the cold move capability; and  
Classification Society Bollard Pull test results for the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel.

**INSERT:**

Classification Society Bollard Pull test results for the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel.

**Clarification #3**

Ref Q.72. and A.72. Canada provides the following additional modifications:

At Annex G, Table 2 – Technical Bid Evaluation Matrix:

**DELETE:**

- b.) Proven Parent In-Service Vessel
- 6.) Proof that the vessel was built in the last 10 years;

**INSERT:**

- b.) Proven Parent In-Service Vessel
- 6.) Proof that the vessel was designed and built in the last 12 years;  
Note: The Contract Award date for the vessel build contract is accepted as the design date and the date of first steel cutting for the vessel is accepted as the build date.

Under the column titled “Description of Mandatory Requirement Technical Bid”:

**DELETE:**

Proof that the vessel was built in the last 10 years demonstrated by providing the following;  
Contract Award date for vessel build contract; and  
Name of shipyard awarded contract; and  
Date of first steel cutting for the vessel.

**INSERT:**

Proof that the vessel was designed and built in the last 12 years demonstrated by providing the following;  
Contract Award date for vessel build contract; and

Name of shipyard awarded contract; and  
Date of first steel cutting for the vessel.

At Annex A, SRD – NLTP-2191

DELETE:

The proven parent must have been designed, built and entered into service within the last 10 years.

INSERT:

The proven parent must have been designed and built and entered into service within the last 12 years.

**Q.75.** As the result of the Canada's answers to bidder's questions some NLTP requirements contained within the Bid Evaluation Criteria have been modified or removed. For example, NLTP-422's Fire Fighting requirements for the PPISV and NLTP-416 changes from ACCU Notation to ABCU Notation. Can Canada please issue revised "**Appendix A: Table 1 - Technical Compliance Matrix**" and "**Appendix B: Table 5 - Vessel Technical Requirements**" that reflect all modifications that have occurred as the result of the Q&A process.

**A.75.** Canada agrees to provide a modified version of Annex G which reflects all changes that have occurred as a result of the Q&A process up to and including Amendment # 13. Version to be provided shortly.

#### **Clarification #4**

Ref Q.13. and A.13. Canada provides the following additional modification:

At Annex G, Table 1 – Technical Compliance Matrix - NLTP-460

Under the column titled "Description of Requirement":

DELETE:

The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must achieve a minimum free-running speed of 12 knots in a fully loaded, deep departure condition, in calm water.

INSERT:

The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must achieve a minimum free-running speed of 12 knots (using up to 100% engine MCR) in a fully loaded, deep departure condition, in calm water.

At Annex A, SRD – NLTP-460

DELETE:

The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must achieve a minimum free-running speed of 12 knots in a fully loaded, deep departure condition, in calm water.

INSERT:

The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must achieve a minimum free-running speed of 12 knots (using up to 100% engine MCR) in a fully loaded, deep departure condition, in calm water.

#### **Clarification #5**

Ref Q.17. and A.17. Canada provides the following additional modification:

At Annex A, SRD – Insert row in table after row NLTP-2225:

|                  |  |            |
|------------------|--|------------|
| <b>NLTP-2309</b> | <b>The time required to transfer the 20 tonnes of potable water shall be no more than 1.5 hours.</b> | <b>NLT</b> |
|------------------|--|------------|

#### **Clarification #6**

Ref Q.24, Q.40. and A.24, A.40. Canada provides the following additional modification:

At Annex G, Table 1 – Technical Compliance Matrix - NLTP-451

Under the column titled “Objective evidence required to prove compliance”:

DELETE:

Trials report for performance verification of Proven Parent In-Service Vessel.

INSERT:

A notarized statement from the Masters of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel confirming that the vessel can meet the performance requirement.

#### **Clarification #7**

Ref Q.24, Q.40. and A.24, A.40. Canada provides the following additional modification:

At Annex G, Table 1 – Technical Compliance Matrix - NLTP-452

Under the column titled “Objective evidence required to prove compliance”:

DELETE:

Trials report for performance verification of Proven Parent In-Service Vessel.

INSERT:

A notarized statement from the Masters of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel confirming that the vessel can meet the performance requirement.

#### **Clarification #8**

Ref Q.24, Q.40. and A.24, A.40. Canada provides the following additional modification:

At Annex G, Table 1 – Technical Compliance Matrix - NLTP-453

Under the column titled "Description of Requirement":

DELETE:

The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must have the ability to manoeuvre sideways ("sidestepping") along a line of bearing, on any axis, with the operator having simultaneous and continuous control over the NLT's heading, headway and sternway.

INSERT:

The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel, in a free-sailing condition, must have the ability to manoeuvre sideways ("sidestepping") along a line of bearing, on any axis, with the operator having simultaneous and continuous control over the NLT's heading, headway and sternway.

Under the column titled "Objective evidence required to prove compliance":

DELETE:

Trials report for performance verification of Proven Parent In-Service Vessel.

INSERT:

A notarized statement from the Masters of the Proven Parent In-Service Vessel confirming that the vessel can meet the performance requirement.

At Annex A, SRD – NLTP-453

DELETE:

The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel must have the ability to manoeuvre sideways ("sidestepping") along a line of bearing, on any axis, with the operator having simultaneous and continuous control over the NLT's heading, headway and sternway.

INSERT:

The Proven Parent In-Service Vessel, in a free-sailing condition, must have the ability to manoeuvre sideways ("sidestepping") along a line of bearing, on any axis, with the operator having simultaneous and continuous control over the NLT's heading, headway and sternway.

**Q.76.** As the equipment used on NLT has to be COTS with a proven track record, the value of developing a significant array of complex analysis to demonstrate how OEM maintenance requirements have been derived is somewhat questionable. As FMECA and RCM are cost drivers and add little value beyond some level of engineering assurance, would Canada remove the requirement for FMEA and RCM included in DID-ILS-004? Maintenance recommendations as per OEM documentation would still be delivered but just not show how these requirements had been derived.

**A.76.** DND does not intend for the contractor to derive the OEM maintenance requirements. DND requires a maintenance analysis, but given the nature of the equipment and the design, DND has indicated that OEM maintenance plans must be used in place of a separate analysis as per para 5.0 of the DID. Where that is not possible (i.e., there is no OEM maintenance plan or the item will not be operated in accordance with the OEM specifications) the contractor must perform the analysis steps as required in the DID.

**Q.77.** Based on final delivery destination, no towing from shipyard to delivery points, and all 4 tugs being built in the one shipyard, we feel no more than 500 hours on the main engines are not adequate for 2 of the tugs. We are requesting to increase that amount to 1000 hours or alternatively we can offer a complete engine overhaul at point of Final Acceptance (2 Tugs only apply).

If heavy lift semi-submersible transport is intended, we would like to indicate that this will be a very significant cost addition to the tender price. We are kindly asking Canada to consider one of our 2 options.

**A.77.** Canada will not be modifying the requirements for delivery.

**Q.78.** Based on the amount of technical data, delay in receiving final drawings & specifications and the continuing amendments being issued we are requesting a solicitation closing date extension of 4 weeks or a reasonable extension offering.

**A.78.** The solicitation closing date remains unchanged. A bid closing date extension had already been granted from August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2018 to October 31<sup>st</sup>, 2018.

**Q.79.** Table 6, third paragraph says: *«For the purposes of this evaluation, construction projects where more than one boat was built under the same project will only be counted as a single project. For example, a project to construct five 15m boats counts as one construction project, not five.»*

Can you confirm that two vessels built to the same design, with separate Class Approval, for two different contracts, with one or more year of interval count for 2 projects?

**A.79.** Canada confirms the following modification;

At Annex G, - Table 6 – Boat Construction Experience

Delete: For the purposes of this evaluation, construction projects where more than one boat was built under the same project will only be counted as a single project. For example, a project to construct five 15m boats counts as one construction project, not five. The vessel construction project submitted in response to the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria may be used for the Technical Point Rated Evaluation.

Insert: For the purposes of this evaluation, construction projects where more than one boat was built under the same project will only be counted as a single project. For example, a project to construct five 15m boats counts as one construction project, not five. For purposes of this evaluation, Canada will accept the same design built under different projects with different contracts, to the same or different companies, as separate examples of Boat Construction Experience. The vessel construction project submitted in response to the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria may be used for the Technical Point Rated Evaluation.

**Q.80.** Are we to add the translation costs to our submission if an OEM manual is only in one official language? As per the SOW 2.2.8 – “If bilingual documentation is not provided from the supplier or OEM, the Contractor should obtain a written authorization from the supplier or OEM in question to grant Canada the rights to translate into the other official language.”

**A.80.** DND confirms that if the OEM information is only available in one official language, it is not necessary for the Contractor to translate the document. However, the Contractor should obtain written



authorization from the supplier or OEM to grant Canada the rights to translate the documents into the other official language.

**Q.81.** Will the OEM manuals have to be re-created in Canadian Forces Order Technical Orders (CFTO) format and given a National Defence Index of Documentation (NDID)? If so, Canada will provide the NDID to the contractor and any future changes to the OEMs would be added as a supplement.

**A.81.** DND confirms that it is not required to re-create the OEM manuals in CFTO format.

**Q.82.** Can Canada clarify what is acceptable format for DID-ILS-003 TDP?

**A.82.** Canada confirms that unless otherwise stated in the SOW, DID-ILS-003 and any associated DIDs, a Contractor selected format is acceptable for the Technical Data Package.

**Q.83.** In DID-ILS-003 3.0 – it states:

“ The following individual publications must be developed in **both official languages**:

- a. Trim, Stability and Freeboard Report (Trim and Stability Book);
- b. Inclining Report;
- c. Lightship Check;
- d. Propulsion System Operation and Maintenance Manual including text, figures and illustrations;
- e. Electrical System Operation and Maintenance Manual including text, figures and illustrations;
- f. Auxiliary System Operation and Maintenance Manual including text, figures and illustrations; and
- g. Shipboard Plans for Fire Protection Appliances, Life-Saving Appliances and Means of Escape.”

If some of these manuals are English only OEMs are they to be translated into French?

Number 4.0 of same DID conflicts “...The technical manuals must be provided in both official languages if available from the OEM.”

Does this imply that the English only OEMs will be acceptable and not have to be translated?

The SOW and DID contradict each other, one place tells you to translate, others it's not required.

Are Contractor's/Designer's manuals to be considered as exceptions like Training manuals in Q&A #49?

**A.83.** Canada confirms that where specified, documentation shall be developed and provided in both official languages. To further clarify, if portions of the System Operation and Maintenance Manuals are direct from a supplier or OEM and are unavailable in both English and French, it is not the responsibility of the Contractor to translate the documents. However, as per section 2.2.8 of the SOW: “If bilingual documentation is not provided from the supplier or OEM, the Contractor should obtain a written authorization from the supplier or OEM in question to grant Canada the rights to translate into the other official language.”

Where Contractor/Designer manuals are existing or being developed as part of the deliverables of the NLT contract they must be provided in bilingual format if that requirement is indicated in the SOW.

**Q.84.** Will DND consider accepting a proven parent vessel designed, built, and entered into service within the last 14 years?

**A.84.** Canada will accept a proven parent vessel designed, built, and entered into service within the last 14 years.

At Annex G, Table 2 – Technical Bid Evaluation Matrix:

DELETE:

- b.) Proven Parent In-Service Vessel
- 6.) Proof that the vessel was built in the last 12 years;

INSERT:

- b.) Proven Parent In-Service Vessel
- 6.) Proof that the vessel was designed and built in the last 14 years;

Note: The Contract Award date for the vessel build contract is accepted as the design date and the date of first steel cutting for the vessel is accepted as the build date.

Under the column titled “Description of Mandatory Requirement Technical Bid”:

DELETE:

Proof that the vessel was built in the last 12 years demonstrated by providing the following;  
Contract Award date for vessel build contract; and  
Name of shipyard awarded contract; and  
Date of first steel cutting for the vessel.

INSERT:

Proof that the vessel was designed and built in the last 14 years demonstrated by providing the following;  
Contract Award date for vessel build contract; and  
Name of shipyard awarded contract; and  
Date of first steel cutting for the vessel.

At Annex A, SRD – NLTP-2191

DELETE:

The proven parent must have been designed, built and entered into service within the last 12 years.

INSERT:

The proven parent must have been designed and built and entered into service within the last 14 years.

**Q.85.** Clarifying the details on how to fill the forms:

How should we confirm the receipt of all addenda:

- Provide only the cover page of the last addenda, or
- Include the cover pages of all addenda, or
- Include them in full and in what order?

**A.85.** As per clause 2003 article 05 (2018-05-22) Submission of bids;

1. Canada requires that each bid, at solicitation closing date and time or upon request from the Contracting Authority, be signed by the Bidder or by an authorized representative of the Bidder. If a bid is submitted by a joint venture, it must be in accordance with section 17.

Please sign and authorize the front page of the last amendment. This will acknowledge that the bidder has reviewed all previous solicitation amendments.

**Q.86.** At Annex B, Basis of Payment, Table 1. Could you remove Subtotal A and B in column A and B as they may lead to confusion.

**A.86.** Yes please see below the amended Table 1. The rest of Annex B remains unchanged.

#### Price Evaluation

All firm prices and hourly rates must be in Canadian dollars, Canadian customs duty and excise tax included, Incoterms 2000 Delivered Duty Paid (DDP) to the delivery points identified, GST and HST extra, as applicable.

**Price Table 1**

|               |   | Column A            | Column B | Column C<br>(=A X B)    |
|---------------|---|---------------------|----------|-------------------------|
| Item #        | Description   | Unit Price<br>CDN\$ | Quantity | Total per Item<br>CDN\$ |
| 1             | Naval Large Tug   | \$                  | 4        | \$                      |
| 2             | Transportation Cost per Tug to CFB Esquimalt  | \$                  | 2        | \$                      |
| 3             | Transportation Cost per Tug to CFB Halifax  | \$                  | 2        | \$                      |
| 4             | Technical Data Package for all vessels  | \$                  | 4        | \$                      |
| 5             | Training for all vessels  | \$                  | 4        | \$                      |
| 6             | Two (2) year operational spares for all vessels   | \$                  | 4        | \$                      |
| Subtotal<br>A | Total Contract Price <del>(sum column A item #1-#6) and</del> (sum column C item #1-#6) | *****               | *****    | \$                      |
| 7             | Cost of Contract Financial Security   | \$                  | 1        | \$                      |

|               |   |                              |                         |                                 |
|---------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Subtotal B    | Total Proposed Contract Price <del>(sum column A subtotal A + item #7)</del> and (sum column C subtotal A + item #7)  | *****                        | *****                   | \$                              |
|               | <b>The indicated number # of hours for items 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 below are for evaluation purposes only. The Hourly Rate is a firm rate for the duration of the contract.</b> |                              |                         |                                 |
| <b>Item #</b> | <b>Description</b>  | <b>Hourly Rate<br/>CDN\$</b> | <b>Quantity<br/>hrs</b> | <b>Total per Item<br/>CDN\$</b> |
| 8             | Engineering Services  | \$                           | 100                     | \$                              |
| 9             | Foreperson  | \$                           | 100                     | \$                              |
| 10            | General Labour  | \$                           | 100                     | \$                              |
| 11            | Supervision   | \$                           | 100                     | \$                              |
| 12            | Administrator   | \$                           | 100                     | \$                              |
|               | Total Evaluated Price (Sum of subtotal B plus items #8-12)  |                              |                         | \$                              |

**Q.87.** DID-ILS-003 item 7.0 specifies that TDP drawings must be those listed in DID-E-007 but updated in as-fitted. DID-E-007 in section 2.0 specifies that contractor must provide, as a minimum, the information, drawings and background material. Does DND consider the following drawings to be provided in as-fitted format: Table of offsets, Welding schedule, Doors and hatches schedule, Windows, and portlight and sidelights schedule, Paint schedule, Electrical cable schedule and items under h. Calculations and Analysis?

**A.87.** DND provides the following clarification with respect to the Technical Data Package (TDP) referenced in DID-ILS-003:

All those items subsequently referenced and listed in DID-E-007 as forming part of the TDP at section 2.0, all items included under (a) through to and including (g) and item (h)-7 must reflect the vessel configuration at acceptance with the exception of section 2.0, item (a)-9, Table Of Offsets. The Table of Offsets must be included in the TDP and will reflect the Proven Parent Vessel hull configuration.

With respect to DID-E-007, section 2.0, item (h), all other items with the exception of (h)-7, noted above, do not have to be delivered as part of the TDP as they are deliverables under separate DIDs.

**Q.88.** At section 6.4 Security for Performance – Letter, 6.4.1 the bidder shall provide a letter which confirm it can provide the contract Financial Security described in Annex H Part 1. Is it acceptable to PWGSC that the letter of intention include this limitation clause for floating for project W8472-185713.

**"It is understood and agreed that if the final contract bonds are required, the Surety shall only be liable under these bonds for the physical performance of the construction work and the supply of the equipment stipulated in the Contract; moreover and without limiting the generality of the foregoing, these bonds will exclude any liability of the Surety for any claim related directly or indirectly to the performance of the ship and more particularly the floating capacity which may have been altered following the work performed in accordance with the contract.**

**R.88.** The Financial Security remains unchanged at Annex "H". A bid, including a letter in accordance with section 6.4, may not alter the terms and conditions of the solicitation. A bid which includes additional terms and conditions will be found non-compliant.